



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,960	12/21/2000	Benjamin N. Eldridge	P3D4-US	3621

27520 7590 07/30/2003

FORMFACTOR, INC.
LEGAL DEPARTMENT
2140 RESEARCH DRIVE
LIVERMORE, CA 94550

EXAMINER

NORRIS, JEREMY C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/746,960

Applicant(s)

ELDRIDGE ET AL.

Examiner

Jeremy C. Norris

Art Unit

2827

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 50-55, 57-59 and 325-345 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 325-345 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 50-53, 55 and 59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 54, 57 and 58 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Examiner has fully considered Applicants' arguments regarding the withdrawal of claims 325-345 from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species, but does not find them persuasive. Examiner believes that Applicants' traversal stems from a mischaracterization of the original restriction requirement. In that Office Action the restriction requirement specifically stated that the mounting configurations were **defined by** (emphasis added) the figures themselves. By defining the species in this manner, any limitations that are outside of what is shown in the elected figure is necessarily drawn to a different, non-elected, species. Applicants' have further requested a listing of the distinctions between each of the disclosed species. Examiner submits that Applicants' themselves have provided such a listing in the brief description of the drawings found on pages 31-49 of the instant application.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the sectional views are not properly cross-hatched (see MPEP 608.02). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the second component

connected to the member as recited in claim 50 must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

Drawing corrections in compliance with MPEP 608.024v) are required in response to this office action.

Examiner is not persuaded by Applicants' arguments regarding the objections to the drawings. First, as described above, and contrary to Applicants' assertion, the species elected, and therefore the claims readable thereon are indeed limited to the elected figure. Since there is no second component in that figure, an objection to the drawings is proper. Secondly, while Examiner stipulates that the MPEP allows for different hatching pattern to be used, it clearly states, "Hatching **must** be used to indicate section portions of an object" (emphasis added). If Applicants are opposed to the suggested hatching patterns, Applicants are invited to utilize a different scheme, provided it complies with MPEP 608.02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 50-53, 55, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 5,317,479 (hereafter Pai).

Art Unit: 2827

Pai discloses, referring to figure 4A, an electrical connection between two electronic components, comprising: a conductive path consisting essentially of a metallic coating (62) having at least one electrically-conductive layer, said metallic coating disposed on an elongate member (56), said coating extending between and interconnecting two electronic components (52, 54) wherein said elongate member comprises a first material (copper beryllium and cobalt alloy) and said metallic coating comprises a second material (solder) that is more resilient than said first material [claim 50], wherein the coating is a plating having at least one layer [claim 51], wherein the elongate member is a wire [claim 52], wherein the wire is electrically conductive [claim 53], wherein the wire comprises copper alloy [claim 55], wherein the plating is solder [claim 59].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 50-53, 55, and 59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 54, 57 and 58 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 4,518,112, granted to Miller et al..

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeremy C. Norris whose telephone number is 703-306-5737. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Th., 9AM - 6:30 PM and alt. Fri. 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0725 for regular communications and 703-308-0725 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2827

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

JCSN
July 27, 2003



DAVID L. TALBOT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800